



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/466,113	12/17/1999	JAMES P. KETRENOS	ITL-0248US (P7373)	9791
21906 7590 09/16/2009 TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C. 1616 S. VOSS ROAD, SUITE 750 HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631				
EXAMINER				
MIRZA, ADNAN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2445				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/16/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/466,113  
Filing Date: December 17, 1999  
Appellant(s): KETRENOS ET AL.

---

Timothy N. Trop  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 05/07/2009 appealing from the Office action mailed 12/11/2008.

**(1) *Real Party in Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences***

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences, which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

**(3) *Status of Claims***

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) *Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of the amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) *Summary of Claimed Subject Matter***

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

The following is a listing of the prior art of record relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal.

**6,513,048**

**Eagle et al**

**01-2003**

**6,421,777**

**Pierre-Louis et al**

**07-2002**

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-24 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eagle et al (U.S. 6,513,048) and further in view of Pierre-Louis et al (U.S. 6,421,777).

As per claims 1,8,17 Eagle disclosed a method comprising: receiving a request for a portion of a file system by a client (col. 2, lines 61-63).

However Eagle did not disclose in detail identifying whether the portion is stored in a first location associated with portions of the file system that have been previously stored by the client. determining whether the portion is stored in a second location associated with portions of the file system that were streamed to the client by a server.

In the same field of endeavor Pierre-Louis disclosed, "The process begins by the client machine being turned on (step 500). A determination is then made as to whether to boot from the network (step 502). If the client is not to boot from the network, then the client boots from the bios boot device loaded in the client (step 504) with the process terminating thereafter (col. 10, lines 25-30). One ordinary skill in the art knows at the

time of the invention that the second portion of data stream is loaded up from the client with the process terminating thereafter is interpreted as the portions stored in the second location associated with portions of the file system that were streamed to the client by a server. The data is interpreted as boot file loaded from the client machine.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated the process begins by the client machine being turned on (step 500). A determination is then made as to whether to boot from the network (step 502). If the client is not to boot from the network, then the client boots from the bios boot device loaded in the client (step 504) with the process terminating thereafter as taught by Pierre-Louis in the method and system of Eagle to provide a system for deploying applications across the Internet that provides programs which execute quickly at remote sites.

4. As per claim 2,15 Eagle- Pierre-Louis disclosed further comprising retrieving the portion from the server if not stored in the second location (Pierre-Louis, col. 10 lines 25-30).

5. As per claim 3,13 Eagle- Pierre-Louis disclosed wherein identifying further comprises associating portions of the file system used by the client during start-up with the first location (Pierre-Louis, col. 9, lines 32-38).

6. As per claims 4,14,19 Eagle- Pierre-Louis disclosed wherein determining further comprises associating the second location with portions of the file system that were streamed to the client using a multicast operation (Eagle, col. 6, lines 54-66).

7. As per claims 5,22,23 Eagle- Pierre-Louis disclosed wherein associating further comprises: monitoring accesses to a plurality of portions of the file system during start-up; retrieving the plurality of portions from the file system; and storing the plurality of portions in the first location (Pierre-Louis, col. 9, lines 10-19).

8. As per claim 6,20,21 Eagle- Pierre-Louis disclosed wherein associating further comprises: retrieving a plurality of portions from the file system using multicasting; and storing the plurality of portions in the second location (Eagle, col. 6, lines 54-66).

9. As per claim 7,24 Eagle- Pierre-Louis disclosed further comprising waiting for the portion to be streamed to the client if not stored in the second location (Eagle, col. 6, lines 54-66).

10. As per claim 9 Eagle- Pierre-Louis disclosed wherein the first location is a non-volatile storage medium (Eagle, col. 3, lines 11-27).

11. As per claim 10,18 Eagle- Pierre-Louis disclosed wherein the non-volatile storage medium is a flash memory device (Eagle, col. 3, lines 11-27).

12. As per claim 11 Eagle- Pierre-Louis disclosed wherein the second location is a volatile storage medium (Eagle, col. 3, lines 11-27).

13. As per claim 12 Eagle- Pierre-Louis disclosed wherein the volatile storage medium is a memory device (Eagle, col. 3, lines 11-27).

14. As per claim 16 Eagle- Pierre-Louis disclosed wherein the contents of the second location are procured as a background operation (Eagle, col. 2, lines 57-64)

**(10) Appellant's arguments:**

A. Appellant argued that Pierre-Louis did not disclose, whether a portion of the file System is stored in a first location associated with portions of the file system that have been previously stored or, if not determining whether portion is stored in a second location associated with portions of the file system that were streamed to the client by the server.

As to Appellant's argument Pierre-Louis clearly disclosed that the portion of the file system that is interpreted as data file stored in more than one location among different networks. One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention knows that portion of the file system in the claim language is considered as whole file. Therefore in Pierre-Louis the file is the boot file as whole. Where portions are the shared boot file saved on



different locations some of the files are stored on the remote side and others are on the local side within a network as in col. 10 lines 20-54 described below.

With reference now to FIG. 5, a flowchart of a client boot sequence is depicted in accordance with a preferred embodiment of the present invention. In this example, the flowchart is directed towards setting up a new client and installing the operating system on the client.

The process begins by the client machine being turned on (step 500). A determination is then made as to whether to boot from the network (step 502). If the client is not to boot from the network, then the client boots from the bios boot device located in the client (step 504) with the process terminating thereafter.

With reference again to step 502, if the BIOS indicates that the client is to boot from the network, then a boot request is sent over the network to the server (step 506). This sending of the boot request onto the network is also referred to as sending a request "on the wire". Thereafter, a determination is made as to whether the server responded with a boot image (step 508). If the server has not responded with a boot image, the process returns to step 506. Otherwise, a determination is made as to whether the boot image redirects the boot to a local image on the client (step 510). If the boot image redirects to a local image on the client, then the boot is performed locally (step 512) with the process terminating thereafter.

On the other hand, if the boot image does not redirect to a local image on the client, then a remote boot is performed using the boot image (step 514). Thereafter, the client connects to the shared directories IBMLANS 416 and WRKFILES 414 in FIG. 4 setup on the server (step 516). Thereafter, the state program is run (step 518). In FIG. 5B, a determination is then made as to whether the state is new (step 520). If the state is new, the process then proceeds to issue a Fdisk command (step 522). Fdisk is used to create a disk partition. A determination is then made as to whether the Fdisk command provided a successful result (step 524).

(C)

Additionally for further clarity examiner has compared Fig.5 A of the prior art (Left Side) and fig. 5 of appellant's specification below.

U.S. Patent Jul. 16, 2002 Sheet 4 of 7 US 6,421,777 B1




FIG. 5A




FIGURE 5

From the figure above it is clearly shown that prior art figure. 5A (left side) disclosed the portion of the file system that is interpreted as data file stored in more than one location among different networks as in appellant's figure 5 (right side). Therefore Pierre-Louis discloses the argued the limitation.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Respectfully submitted,

/Adnan M Mirza/

Examiner, Art Unit 2445

August, 17<sup>th</sup>, 2009

Conferees

/Larry D Donaghue/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454

TROP, PRUNER, HU & MILES, P.C.  
TIMOTHY N. TROP  
8554 KATY FREEWAY, SUITE 100  
HOUSTON, TX, 77024  
UNITED STATES

/VIVEK SRIVASTAVA/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2445

